

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1969

ALEKSANDR J. STOYANOV; YURI J. STOYANOV,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

DONALD C. WINTER, Secretary of the Navy; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 70, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JAMES H. KING, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JOHN C. DAVIES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Deputy Head of Code 74, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; STEPHAN M. FARLEY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 741, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge.
(1:05-cv-01567-RDB)

Submitted: February 21, 2008

Decided: February 25, 2008

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Aleksandr J. Stoyanov, Yuri J. Stoyanov, Appellants Pro Se. John
Walter Sippel, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aleksandr J. Stoyanov and Yuri J. Stoyanov appeal the district court's orders dismissing their claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634 (2000), and the Whistleblower Protection Act, 5 U.S.C. § 2302 (2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Stoyanov v. Winter, No. 1:05-cv-01567-RDB (D. Md. July 25, 2006; Aug. 15, 2007). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED